UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,163	04/25/2001	Sunil Maulik	GMS 301	8585

7590　　　12/08/2003	

James R. Abney
KOLISCH, HARTWELL, DICKINSON
McCORMACK & HEUSER
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97204

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	6

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
● **Office Action Summary**	09/843,163 ●	MAULIK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 April 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _4, 5_.	6) ☐ Other: .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 11-03)   **Office Action Summary**   Part of Paper No. 6

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by Lubin et al. ("Lubin", US 5,395,243).

As per independent claim 1, Lubin teaches a computer-based educational system,

comprising:

A content pane configured to present a presentation of a series of slides (*72* of fig. 5a);

and

A progress control configured to adjust a user's progress through a currently displayed

slide (highlighted cursor on slide *72* of fig. 5a).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin teaches the currently displayed

slide includes a plurality of frames (plurality of frames in slide *72* of fig. 5a), and the progress

control is configured to adjust the currently displayed frame of the currently displayed slide

(highlight the displayed frame *USING TYING KEYS* on slide 72 of fig. 5a).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2, Lubin teaches the progress control further

includes distinguishable regions indicating a previously viewed portion of the currently

displayed slide and a remaining portion of the currently displayed slide (highlighted cursor in fig.

5a is used as a distinguisher indicating a previously viewed portion of the currently displayed

slide and a remaining portion of the currently displayed slide).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin teaches a table of contents pane

including hyperlinks to the slides of the presentation (*42* of fig. 2).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin teaches a slide title pane

configured to display a title of the currently displayed slide (*42* of fig. 2).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, since Lubin's interactive learning system

can generate audio instruction via the speakers (col. 3, lines 18-24), it is inherent to have a

volume control configured to control the volume of the presentation displayed in the content

pane.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin teaches the presentation includes

voiceover narration, the system further comprising, a transcript selector configured to cause a

text transcript of the voiceover narration to be displayed (col. 3, lines 25-53).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin teaches a help selector configured

to cause a help file related to the presentation to be displayed (col. 8, lines 57-64).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin teaches a resource selector

configured to cause a resources list related to the presentation to be displayed (*DETAIL* of fig.

5b).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin teaches a course selector

configured to enable a user to choose a presentation to be viewed in the content pane (fig. 3a and

3b).

As per independent claim 20, Lubin teaches a computer-based educational system,

comprising:

a content pane configured to present a series of slides (*72* of fig. 5a), the slides being

accompanied by voiceover narration and a link to a text transcript of the voiceover narration (col.

3, lines 25-53).

As per independent claim 23, it is a similar scope to claim 20; therefore, it should be

rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 4, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubin

in view of Kaply (US 6,215,490).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Lubin teaches the progress control is

configured to enable the user to sequentially scroll through the frames of the slide, however

Lubin does not disclose the content pane is configured to display the frames in real-time as the

user scrolls. Kaply discloses in fig. 6A-6C when a user scrolls along the progress control 232, the

window frames A, B, and C are displayed in real-time. It would have been obvious to an artisan

at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply of displaying the frames in real-time

as scrolling along the progress control in Lubin's system since it would help to make the process

of displaying the selected frame faster.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin does not disclose the progress

control includes slider having a handle. Kaply disclose in fig. 6A a progress control includes

slider 232 having a handle 234. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the

invention to use the teaching from Kaply of including slider having a handle in the progress

control in Lubin's system since it would be easier to scroll along the progress control using a

slider with a handle.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin does not disclose a slide indicator configured to indicate the number of the current slide and the number of total slides in the presentation. Kaply disclose that as *206* of fig. 5A. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply of including a slide indicator configured to indicate the number of the current slide and the number of total slides in the presentation in Lubin's system since it would allow a user to quickly recognize the total number of slides and which one is currently displayed.

5. Claims 6, 7, 19, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubin in view of Meyn et al. ("Meyn", US 5,859,623).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin does not disclose navigation controls selected from the group consisting of next slide control, previous slide control, rewind slide control, play control, and pause control. Meyn discloses navigation controls *221-228* (fig. 2D; col. 12, lines 37-50) used to control the frame displays. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Meyn of including navigation controls selected from the group consisting of next slide control, previous slide control, rewind slide control, play control, and pause control in Lubin's system since it would help to make the process of displaying the selected slide faster.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin does not disclose the progress control is configured to indicate a user's time-based viewing progress through the currently displayed slide. Meyn discloses a user's time-based viewing progress 252 (fig. 2D; col. 12, line

51- col. 13, line 7) through the currently displayed slide. It would have been obvious to an artisan

at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Meyn of indicating a user's time-based

viewing progress through the currently displayed slide in Lubin's system since it would help a

user to monitor how much time left for the displayed slide.

As per independent claim 19, Lubin teaches a computer-based educational system,

comprising:

a content pane configured to present a presentation of a series of slides (*72* of fig. 5a);

Lubin does not disclose a progress indicator configured to indicate a user's time-based viewing

progress through the presentation. Meyn discloses a user's time-based viewing progress 252 (fig.

2D; col. 12, line 51- col. 13, line 7) through the currently displayed slide. It would have been

obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Meyn of indicating a

user's time-based viewing progress through the currently displayed slide in Lubin's system since

it would help a user to monitor how much time left for the displayed slide.

As per independent claim 22, it is a similar scope to claim 19; therefore, it should be

rejected under the same rationale.

As per independent claim 24, Lubin teaches a computer-based educational method,

comprising:

displaying a presentation of a series of slides in a content pane (*72* of fig. 5a), the slides having accompanying voiceover narration; providing a user-selectable link to a text transcript of the voiceover narration (col. 3, lines 25-53); and

Lubin does not disclose indicating a user's time-based viewing progress through the presentation via a progress indicator. Meyn discloses a user's time-based viewing progress 252 (fig. 2D; col. 12, line 51- col. 13, line 7) through the currently displayed slide. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Meyn of indicating a user's time-based viewing progress through the currently displayed slide in Lubin's system since it would help a user to monitor how much time left for the displayed slide.

6.   Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubin.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin does not disclose a progress indicator independent from and operatively linked to the progress control, such that progress adjustments made via the progress control are directly reflected in the progress indicator. The Examiner takes Official Notice that progress indicator is well known in the computer art. For example, when downloading program from the Internet using Windows operating system, a progress indicator always shown up indicating the progress of downloading. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to apply the Official Notice of including a progress indicator in Lubin's system since it would improve user's ability of observing the progress of viewing the frames.

As per 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin does not disclose a pop-up window

selector configured to display a pop-up window containing detailed information related to the

currently displayed slide. The Examiner takes Official Notice that pop-up window technology to

give further information on the selected object is well known and widely used in Windows

operating system as well as Internet Web pages. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the

time of the invention to apply the Official Notice of including a pop-up window selector

configured to display a pop-up window containing detailed information related to the currently

displayed slide in Lubin's system since it would allow a user to learn more in detail about the

selected slide.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubin in view of

Seaman et al. ("Seaman", US 5,414,644).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 1, Lubin does not disclose a glossary

selector configured to cause a glossary related to the presentation to be displayed. Seaman

discloses a glossary selector is used in the presentation (col. 9, lines 9-35). It would have been

obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Seaman of including a

glossary selector related to the presentation to be displayed in Lubin's system since it would

improve Lubin's learning system by allowing a user to check on a collection of textual glosses.

8. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubin in view of

Kaply and further in view of Meyn.

As per independent claim 21, Lubin teaches a computer-based educational system, comprising:

a content pane configured to present a presentation of a series of slides, each slide consisting of one or more frames (*72* of fig. 5a), the presentation including voiceover narration (col. 3, lines 25-53);

a progress control configured to adjust a user's progress through a currently displayed slide, by adjusting the currently displayed frame of the currently displayed slide (highlight the displayed frame *USING TYING KEYS* on slide 72 of fig. 5a), Lubin does not disclose the content pane is configured to display the frames in real-time as the user scrolls. Kaply discloses in fig. 6A-6C when a user scrolls along the progress control *232*, the window frames *A*, *B*, and *C* are displayed in real-time. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply of displaying the frames in real-time as scrolling along the progress control in Lubin's system since it would help to faster the process of displaying the selected frame.

a transcript selector configured to cause a text transcript of the voiceover narration to be displayed (col. 3, lines 25-53);

Lubin does not disclose the progress control includes slider having a handle. Kaply disclose in fig. 6A a progress control includes slider *232* having a handle *234*. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply of including slider having a handle in the progress control in Lubin's system since it would be easier to scroll along the progress control using a slider with a handle.

Kaply's progress control slider *232*, in fig. 6A, clearly shows distinguishable regions indicating a previously viewed portion of the currently displayed slide and a remaining portion of the currently displayed slide.

Lubin in view of Kaply does not disclose one or more navigation controls selected from the group consisting of next slide control, previous slide control, rewind slide control, play control, and pause control. Meyn discloses navigation controls *221-228* (fig. 2D; col. 12, lines 37-50) used to control the frame displays. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Meyn of including navigation controls selected from the group consisting of next slide control, previous slide control, rewind slide control, play control, and pause control in the modified Lubin's system since it would help to make the process of displaying the selected slide faster.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6590586 B1 to Swenton-Wall, Patricia L. et al. discloses interactive learning system.

US 5634018 A to Tanikoshi, Koichiro et al. discloses user interface for a browser based image storage and processing system.

US 6204840 B1 to Petelycky, Ihor et al. discloses presentation supporting method and apparatus therefor.

Inquiries

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kristine Kincaid

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
November 26, 2003

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100